United Nations A/HRC/39/31

General Assembly

Distr.: General
31 July 2018

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Thirty-ninth session
10–28 September 2018
Agenda items 2 and 3
Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General

Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development

Summary of the intersessional workshop on the right to peace

Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

Summary

In its resolution 35/4, the Human Rights Council decided to convene a half-day intersessional workshop to discuss the implementation of the Declaration on the Right to Peace and requested the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to submit a report on the workshop, in the form of a summary, to the Council at its thirty-ninth session.

The present report provides a summary of the discussions at the workshop, which was held in Geneva on 14 June 2018. At the workshop, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights, six panellists and other participants made recommendations, notably on possible means to build peace within and between societies pursuant to article 2 of the Declaration on the Right to Peace, on sustainable measures in line with article 3 of the Declaration and on educating for peace in accordance with article 4.

GE.18-12633(E)

1812633

Please recycle

I. Introduction

1. Pursuant to its resolution 35/4, on 14 June 2018 the Human Rights Council convened in Geneva, with the support of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, a half-day intersessional workshop on the right to peace to discuss the implementation of the Declaration on the Right to Peace. Following an opening statement by the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights, the intersessional workshop was organized in the form of three panel discussions, focusing, respectively, on articles 2, 3 and 4 of the Declaration, followed by concluding remarks from the moderator for the three panel discussions, Jennifer Philpot-Nissen of the World Council of Churches.

2. More than 60 representatives from Member States, specialized United Nations agencies, special procedures of the Council and civil society participated in the discussions. The present report provides a summary of the discussions at the intersessional workshop and the recommendations made by the participants.

II. Opening statement

3. In her opening remarks, the Deputy High Commissioner recalled that the first article of the Declaration on the Right to Peace proclaimed that everyone had the right to enjoy peace such that all human rights were promoted and protected and development was fully realized. In his address to the Council at its thirty-fourth session, the Secretary-General had identified prevention of conflict and its drivers as the priority for everything the United Nations did in support of Member States, and had observed that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights constituted the best prevention tool for that task, as the rights set out in it not only identified many of the root causes of conflict but provided real world solutions through real change on the ground.[1]

4. Respect for international human rights law provided the necessary building blocks to build and sustain peaceful societies and allow them to flourish. Over the past 70 years, those human rights had been renewed and elaborated in international human rights treaties and declarations, including the Declaration on the Right to Peace. As noted in the preamble to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, if man was not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, human rights should be protected by the rule of law. The Deputy High Commissioner asserted that people who did not face discrimination in access to employment, education, food, health care and housing, and who could speak, complain and vote freely to remove tyrants, would rarely take up arms.

5. The multilateral system offered important tools and mechanisms for cooperating on conflict prevention and peace. Nevertheless, stronger cooperation between the Human Rights Council, the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission was possible, needed and crucial in order to better inform and guide United Nations decision-making and engagement towards sustainable peace. The findings of treaty bodies and the special procedures and recommendations from the universal periodic review were also key tools, which required follow-up. Furthermore, integration of human rights expertise in peacekeeping and special political missions should not be eroded but rather strengthened and enhanced.

6. The Deputy High Commissioner noted that the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development provided invaluable opportunities to prevent crises, insecurity, violence and conflict and to build sustainable peace. As part of that rights-encompassing agenda, the Sustainable Development Goals sought to address the root causes of insecurity through a focus on reducing inequalities and eliminating pervasive discrimination in order to ensure more peaceful and inclusive societies. She recommended paying specific attention to the

[1] See www.un.org/sg/en/content/sg/speeches/2017-02-27/secretary-generals-human-rights-council-remarks.

situation of young people in that context, and emphasized that the recent recognition by the Security Council of the powerful potential role of youth for peace and prevention should be matched by the Council's commitment to leading States to better appreciate the importance of respecting the right of young people to a future of sustainable peace. The median age of the populations of countries at war was under 25 years, whereas the populations of countries supplying arms were middle aged and aging rapidly. The Sustainable Development Goals would not be realized without the engagement of youth. The greatest moral, social and political challenge for humanity was to mobilize the energy, creativity and vision of youth in pursuit of peace.

III. Overview of panel presentations and discussions

A. Means to build peace within and between societies

7. The first panel focused on article 2 of the Declaration on the Right to Peace, looking at means to build peace within and between societies, including by ensuring equality and non-discrimination, justice and the rule of law and freedom from fear and want. The panel was chaired by the President of the Human Rights Council, Vojislav Šuc. The panellists were Christian Guillermet-Fernández, Director-General of Foreign Policy at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Costa Rica and former Chair-Rapporteur of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on the draft United Nations declaration on the right to peace (2012–2015), and Maya Brehm, an adviser at the non-governmental organization "Article 36".

8. Mr. Guillermet-Fernández thanked the Deputy High Commissioner for her inspiring opening statement and he acknowledged the contributions by diplomats, representatives of civil society and academics on the long walk that had ultimately led to the adoption of the Declaration on the Right to Peace in 2016. He noted that the Council had been working on the promotion of the right of peoples to peace since 2008, following up on previous resolutions on that subject adopted by the General Assembly and the Commission on Human Rights.

9. Mr. Guillermet-Fernández presented the history of the Declaration. In its resolution 20/15, the Council had established an open-ended intergovernmental working group with the mandate to negotiate a draft declaration on the right to peace, on the basis of a draft submitted by the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee. He had been elected Chairperson-Rapporteur of the working group. At its first session, the working group had noted that the text submitted by the Advisory Committee (A/HRC/20/31) did not have sufficient support, even from those Member States that had actively supported the process within the Council. In order to maintain the important work done by the Advisory Committee, he had decided to revive the spirit of Council resolutions 14/3 and 17/16, which recalled the Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 53/243. He had highlighted that all the main elements of the right to peace identified by the Advisory Committee had been elaborated previously by Member States, international organizations and non-governmental organizations in various declarations and programmes of action, and had argued that the right to peace and the culture of peace were two sides of the same coin.

10. On 1 July 2016, by its resolution 32/28, the Council had adopted the Declaration on the Right to Peace by a majority of its member States and, on 19 December 2016, the General Assembly had adopted the Declaration by its resolution 71/189. The Declaration had been the result of three years of work with various stakeholders, including civil society organizations. However, all States and regional groups within the Council and the General Assembly had been unable to reach full consensus, owing to the lack of agreement on the title and article 1, both of which referred to "the right to peace".

11. Mr. Guillermet-Fernández stressed that the Declaration followed the line of Renaissance humanism. Erasmus of Rotterdam had been the pre-eminent representative of that intellectual and ethical philosophy and, for example, had recognized the right to peace in his book *The Complaint of Peace* in 1517. Other recognized philosophers, poets and

thinkers — such as Hugo Grotius, Immanuel Kant, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Friedrich Schiller, Victor Hugo, Voltaire and Ortega y Gasset — had subsequently contributed positively in their works to elaborating the right to peace. Furthermore, in the period of the League of Nations, several jurists had written important books on international law in which they had developed the principles and norms of the right to peace.

12. Regarding possible measures to implement the Declaration, Mr. Guillermet-Fernández recommended that the international community deploy maximum effort and creativity to reach an agreement on the title and article 1 of the Declaration, the only elements upon which consensus had not been reached during the negotiation process. As a positive example, he referred to the unanimous adoption on 28 March 2018 by the Inter-Parliamentary Union of its resolution on "Sustaining peace as a vehicle for achieving sustainable development", which had recognized the will of the United Nations General Assembly to continue examining the issue of the promotion and protection of the right to peace.

13. Since the Declaration on the Right to Peace focused on persons who suffered in a situation of conflict, Mr. Guillermet-Fernández suggested that the special procedure mandate holders of the Council should elaborate in their respective mandates the multidimensional notion of peace. The role of dialogue, tolerance, mediation, assistance and cooperation in the performance of the different mandates should be reinforced. Furthermore, the Council could request the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) to incorporate the right to peace in its daily activities and undertake activities aimed at strengthening the interconnection between peace, human rights and development. OHCHR could also be requested to provide inter-institutional coordination within the United Nations system, in coordination with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the University for Peace, with respect to the promotion and realization of the three pillars of the United Nations — peace and security, human rights and development.

14. In her presentation, Ms. Brehm addressed the role of States under article 2 of the Declaration, with a particular focus on disarmament as a means of building peace between societies. In over twenty years of work in the field of disarmament and multilateral weapons control, she had not often encountered the terms "right to peace" or "peace". In a book published in 1967 the idea of real peace in the world and general disarmament had been looked on as utopian,[2] and in 2018 it seemed that peace was still not a possibility that disarmament practitioners prepared for. In the sphere of multilateral weapons regulation, non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament the notion of "peace" tended to be confined to the preambles of instruments and declarations of major conferences or to statements made by observers and non-governmental organizations.

15. Ms. Brehm also highlighted that the term "peace" was often accompanied by the term "security". For example, the Secretary-General had recently expressed hope that the agenda set out in *Securing Our Common Future: an Agenda for Disarmament* would help set the world on a path towards sustainable peace and security for all. The Agenda for Disarmament itself identified peace and security as the central reasons why the United Nations pursued disarmament. The Agenda described disarmament as a tool for preventing and ending armed conflict; mitigating the impacts of conflict; protecting civilians; upholding the principles of humanity; preventing the easy resumption of hostilities; ensuring and maintaining stability; promoting sustainable development; maintaining or restoring international peace and security; and preserving, securing and sustaining peace. Disarmament measures taken by States to achieve those goals could also contribute to the implementation of article 2 of the Declaration, which enjoined States to respect, implement and promote equality and non-discrimination, justice and the rule of law, and to guarantee freedom from fear and want as a means to build peace within and between societies.

16. With regard to multilateral disarmament and weapons control measures grounded in humanitarian principles, Ms. Brehm noted that the focus of such humanitarian disarmament

[2] See Leonard C. Lewin, *Report from Iron Mountain: On the Possibility and Desirability of Peace* (New York, Dial Press, 1967).

was on mitigating the impacts of armed conflict, protecting civilians and upholding the principle of humanity. Thus parties to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects had adopted restrictions and prohibitions on, for example, the use of incendiary weapons and blinding laser weapons in order to alleviate the suffering of the victims of war. States parties were expected to continue the codification and progressive development of the rules of international law applicable in armed conflict and more recently had held talks in response to concerns raised by the increasing autonomy in weapons systems.

17. Ms. Brehm emphasized that disarmament could help guard against the erosion of long-standing legal principles for the protection of the human person. Debates on science, technology and weaponization included the question of how new weapons and evolving practices of armed violence accorded with existing norms and shaped their future development. Furthermore, disarmament practice could also help support the international rule of law, as illustrated by many States' reaffirmation of their commitment to a rules-based international system in reaction to the use of chemical weapons and recent threats to use nuclear weapons.

18. Promoting the rule of law required respect for human rights. While international humanitarian law remained the dominant legal framework for humanitarian disarmament, some instruments explicitly recognized the human rights dimension of weapons and armed violence. Notably, States increasingly accepted a duty to respond to the needs and realize the rights of survivors of anti-personnel landmines, cluster munitions and the remnants of other explosive weapons. Both the Convention on Cluster Munitions and the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons contained provisions under which States assumed an obligation to provide assistance to survivors and other affected persons, without discrimination, including medical care, rehabilitation and psychological support, and to provide for their social and economic inclusion in accordance with human rights law. States had also assumed increasing responsibilities in relation to the aftermath of weapons use. For example, clearance of contaminated land was a key duty assumed by States parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction; the Protocol on Explosive Remnants of War to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects (Protocol V); and the Convention on Cluster Munitions. Under the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, States parties also assumed an obligation to take measures for the environmental remediation of contaminated areas. That was consistent with the recognition in the treaty of the grave implications of nuclear weapons for human survival, the environment, socioeconomic development, the global economy, food security and the health of current and future generations.

19. Beyond measures in relation to particular weapon types, recent humanitarian disarmament debates had also provided an opportunity to engage with more systemic issues that obstructed peace within and between societies. In particular, gendered aspects of armed violence and the differential impacts of weapons had been problematized, for example in relation to so-called signature drone strikes and other applications of algorithm-based targeting and in relation to the use of explosive weapons in populated areas. Furthermore, States parties to the Arms Trade Treaty accepted a duty to assess the risk that weapons proposed for export might be used to commit or facilitate a serious violation of international human rights law or international humanitarian law, including serious acts of gender-based violence. Victim assistance under those instruments had to be age and gender sensitive. The preamble of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons acknowledged the disproportionate impact of ionizing radiation on women and girls and the disproportionate impact of nuclear-weapon activities on indigenous peoples. Ms. Brehm also noted discussions about the lack of inclusiveness and diversity in forums and bodies that deliberated on and made decisions about disarmament policy.

20. Ms. Brehm stressed that disarmament processes offered an important chance for transformation towards more peaceful and less violent ways of resolving conflicts, for example by changing the perception of threats in the relations between actors and by

building confidence. The transformative potential of disarmament would ultimately depend on its capacity to foster an understanding and a conviction that violence-free relations and peaceful conflict resolution were possible and sustainable. Furthermore, disarmament mechanisms contributed to the institutionalization of a cooperative security order. Disarmament institutions could promote multilateralism, uphold the rule of law and develop and maintain norms for the common good; however, they needed to address shortcomings in terms of diversity.

21. Ms. Brehm noted that arms control and disarmament had traditionally focused on preventing the outbreak of war, maintaining international stability and addressing other threats to the military security of the State. Disarmament was still articulated mainly in State-centric terms and in line with negative conceptions of peace. Yet new concepts of security that had been adopted into the disarmament vocabulary over the past two decades recognized that security could not be achieved by working against one another, but only through peaceful cooperation with one another. That had enabled humanitarian disarmament to contribute to the realization of the positive dimensions of peace by addressing threats to the health, safety, well-being and socioeconomic and human development of individuals and groups of people (human security) and by promoting the realization of their rights. Present-day disarmament discourse remained essentially security oriented and did not recognize peace as the goal and the basis for political action. Because security tended to be construed in political practice as the ability to defend one's own interests against perceived threats, security primed the maintenance of peace and justified continued militarization and the development of weapons.

22. Ms. Brehm observed that in disarmament practice peace was either portrayed as a desirable yet illusive end goal that was subordinate to one's own security needs, or as a process meant to civilize the conduct of conflicts through increasing regulation. Humanitarian disarmament, through its emphasis on mitigating the effects of the use of particular weapons, tacitly normalized and legitimized the use of weapons more generally. The security orientation of disarmament hampered its capacity to effectively address the structural causes of violence, foster more peaceful relations among actors and institutionalize a preventive, or even precautionary, orientation to weapons development. In order to promote the conditions of sustainable and positive peace and to break away from the continued cycle of developing new and more effective weapons, there was a need to overcome internalized attitudes, beliefs and behaviours that legitimated the use of force and militarization. Disarmament had to recognize peace as the goal and the basis for political action.

23. In the ensuing discussion, the representative of the Holy See noted that multilateral diplomacy was an important means of ensuring peace and preventing conflict, and that peace was not simply the absence of warfare based on a precarious balance of power, but instead required daily efforts towards achieving justice among all human beings and development that respected each person.

24. Stressing that the right to peace was the backbone for the enjoyment of all human rights, including the right to development, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela stated that the United Nations system should prioritize the implementation of the right to peace and the right to development in view of the increased number of armed conflicts, the arms race, economic sanctions and unilateral coercive measures that hampered the development of entire peoples.

25. The representative of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation stressed the importance of building confidence through disarmament and non-violent communication, which should be taught in schools in order to implement the right to peace and allow future generations to enjoy that right and avoid mass killings.

26. The representative of the Spanish Society for International Human Rights Law reiterated the proposal that had been put forward by 692 civil society organizations in September 2017 to revise General Assembly resolution 71/189 and to include specific references to the right to disarmament; the right to human security; the right to resist and

oppose oppression, including through conscientious objection to military service; and the rights to development and environment.[3]

27. In order to fulfil article 2 of the Declaration, the representative of the Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII suggested that States should reduce their military spending, cooperate with UNESCO and the University for Peace, and create a special rapporteur or alternatively give OHCHR a specific mandate on the right to peace.

28. The representative of the Center for Global Nonkilling called for bringing persons with disabilities into the discussions on the right to peace. He also stressed that war was illegal pursuant to Article 2, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Charter of the United Nations, and that the exception for self-defence was strictly limited under Article 51.

29. In response to the discussion, Mr. Guillermet-Fernández noted common elements that were also reflected in the Declaration. Furthermore, he suggested that national human rights institutions could be encouraged to embrace a right-to-peace perspective, including through the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions.

30. Ms. Brehm urged the participants of the intersessional workshop, including diplomats, to incorporate the workshop's peace-related reflections in their work in the disarmament and arms control field. She stressed the importance of framing resolutions and statements in the disarmament context with consistent language on human rights, peace and sustainability.

B. Sustainable measures

31. Evan Garcia, Vice-President of the Human Rights Council, chaired the second round table, which focused on sustainable measures pursuant to article 3 of the Declaration on the Right to Peace. That article called upon States, the United Nations and specialized agencies, and in particular UNESCO, to take appropriate sustainable measures to implement the Declaration, and it encouraged international, regional, national and local organizations and civil society to support and assist in the implementation of the Declaration. The panellists were Kostantinos Tararas, Programme Specialist in the Sector for Social and Human Sciences at UNESCO, and Jennifer Pochat, from the foundation "Paz Sin Fronteras" (Peace Without Borders).

32. Mr. Tararas recalled that the preamble to the Constitution of UNESCO declared that since wars began in the minds of men, it was in the minds of men that the defences of peace had to be constructed. The focus of UNESCO was to accomplish its humanist mission to support people in understanding each other and working together to build lasting peace, including through education, the sciences, culture, communication and information. The work of UNESCO in advancing the right to peace notably involved efforts to change mindsets through global citizenship education; to create the conditions to enable lasting peace through intercultural and interreligious dialogue; and to expand partnerships by involving new actors such as cities and local authorities.

33. Global citizenship education was the response of UNESCO to the threats posed by poverty and inequalities to peace and sustainability. Global citizenship education aimed to empower learners of all ages to assume active roles, both locally and globally, in building more peaceful, tolerant, inclusive and secure societies. It was based on cognitive, socio-emotional and behavioural domains of learning. A key instrument for promoting global citizenship education was target 4.7 of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which called on countries to ensure that all learners acquired the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture's contribution to sustainable development. In that context, UNESCO had

[3] See http://nedidh.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/CVD-Statement-22.6.18-1.pdf.

been focusing on the prevention of violent extremism, in line with the Secretary-General's Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism (A/70/674).

34. With regard to the promotion of intercultural dialogue and mutual understanding, Mr. Tararas referred to activities in the context of the International Decade for the Rapprochement of Cultures 2013–2022. Those activities were underpinned by the acknowledgement that peace was not simply the absence of war, but a long-term process that required vigilance and mutual understanding through a participatory approach. The priorities of UNESCO during the second half of the International Decade included the creation of a database that focused on enabling conditions for peace, related advocacy and the development of tools to counter discrimination, xenophobia and prejudices against those who were different. In May 2018 UNESCO had published the book, *Long Walk of Peace: Towards a Culture of Prevention*, which highlighted the perspectives of 32 United Nations entities on the challenges of peacebuilding and explored how they had perceived and contributed to the peace agenda within their own areas of competence.

35. In line with the emphasis on implementation at the local level in article 3 of the Declaration, UNESCO was also working on expanding its partnerships, including through the International Coalition of Inclusive and Sustainable Cities. The mandate of that coalition was to promote dialogue among local decision makers, recognizing that they had a key role in promoting human rights and peace. Local authorities were duty bearers for issues that had been delegated to their level, including the right to education, housing, access to employment, participation and access to cultural rights. In 2016 UNESCO had launched the "Welcoming Cities for Refugees and Migrants" initiative, which focused on promoting inclusion and protecting rights.

36. To sustain peace and achieve sustainable development, Mr. Tararas stressed the importance of engaging in strong collective action and enhancing collaboration and partnerships, including with the business community, financial institutions, civil society and regional and subregional organizations. In addition, States should enable civil society organizations to play an active and important role in the policy process. Their role would be instrumental in identifying local level partners and in promoting peace education. With Sustainable Development Goal 11 and the New Urban Agenda as reference points, UNESCO recognized the strategic role of cities in the achievement of global commitments for peace, as the level of governance closest to the inhabitants and to the challenges and opportunities for development.

37. As key messages, Mr. Tararas stressed the need to build on the new dynamic in the area of prevention, as illustrated in recent resolutions from the General Assembly and Security Council and in reports from the Secretary-General. It was also important to promote a whole-of-government approach and to reinforce cooperation with local authorities. Furthermore, in line with a whole-of-society approach, the work with youth and women should be increased in order to promote peace and understanding. Finally, it was important to mainstream a peace perspective throughout the work of the United Nations system and across efforts to achieve all the Sustainable Development Goals.

38. Ms. Pochat said that States and elected representatives had the responsibility to ensure the right to peace, the right to a culture of peace and everyone's human rights; however, legislation regulating the manufacture and trafficking of weapons was lacking or insufficient, Governments were corrupt and there was a lack of political will to end all armed conflicts.

39. Ms. Pochat called for individual and collective initiatives to achieve peace and build bridges so that everyone could experience peace and revive the essence of human values. Art, especially music, could function as a vehicle for persons individually or collectively to express in a creative manner how they saw life. Paz Sin Fronteras, which had been founded by the musicians Miguel Bosé and Juanes, aimed at contributing to the promotion of the values of peace, human rights and tolerance in the world. In order to bring people and communities closer together, the foundation had organized large concerts, for example in Cúcuta, at the border between Colombia and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, and in Havana.

40. The Paz Sin Fronteras foundation also played a fundamental role in mobilizing and raising awareness on the right to peace, which had ultimately led to adoption by the General Assembly of the Declaration on the Right to Peace. On the first anniversary of its adoption, Paz Sin Fronteras, the University for Peace and the UNESCO Chair on Peace, Solidarity and Intercultural Dialogue at Abat Oliba University had launched a book on the history of peace in the West,[4] exploring how various intellectuals and artists had expressed the meaning of living in peace. Through information and communication technologies, the foundation was also reaching out to younger generations and encouraged action to implement the Declaration.

41. Ms. Pochat recommended the creation of a forum for debate or a round table within the Council in order to allow civil society organizations to share best practices on educating for peace and finding peaceful solutions. In that context, she stressed the importance of ensuring a gender balance for participation at such events. Furthermore, she suggested that artists could become "ambassadors for peace" and create songs on the right to peace. Concerts and related videos could be shared on social media in order to generate awareness of how to reduce risks to peace. In addition, law schools could be encouraged to hold debates concerning the right to peace in conjunction with the University for Peace.

42. In the ensuing discussion, the representative of Cuba recalled that the preservation of the right to peace and the promotion of its implementation was a fundamental obligation of all States, which required policies for the elimination of the threat or use of war, in particular nuclear war, and an international system that was based on respect for the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and the promotion of all human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the right to development and the right of peoples to self-determination.

43. The representative of the Spanish Society for International Human Rights Law reiterated the following civil society proposals, which had been made in September 2017:

(a) States, the United Nations and its specialized agencies, funds and programmes should take appropriate sustainable measures to implement the Declaration on the Right to Peace, while international, regional, national and local organizations and civil society should actively participate in its implementation;

(b) All States had to implement the provisions of the Declaration in good faith by adopting relevant legislative, judicial, administrative, educational and other measures necessary to promote its effective realization;

(c) The Human Rights Council should monitor progress in the implementation of the Declaration as a permanent item on its agenda and should appoint a special rapporteur on the human right to peace;

(d) The United Nations human rights treaty bodies and relevant regional bodies should incorporate the Declaration in their protection activities.[5]

44. The representative of the Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII encouraged each State to establish a ministry of peace, which could operate in the following areas:

(a) Human rights, by providing a structure for fulfilling the duty to respect, protect and promote human rights and monitoring compliance with international standards;

(b) Alternative dispute resolution and reconciliation, by promoting a comprehensive and human rights-based approach to dispute resolution in order to solve domestic and international disputes peacefully;

(c) Peace culture and education, by promoting them as crucial tools to address the root causes of long-standing conflicts;

---

[4] Miguel Bosé and David Fernández Puyana, *History of Peace in the West* (San José, 2017).

[5] See article 9 of the draft declaration proposed by civil society organizations on 20 September 2017, available at http://aedidh.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/Draft-UN-Declaration-HRP-20.9.17.pdf.

(d) Promotion of peace policies, by working for the good management and coordination of all the efforts to promote peace and to implement the right to peace;

(e) Violence and conflict prevention, by monitoring and preventing violence and conflicts to pursue peaceful societies and realize the right to peace.

45. The representative of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers noted that the right to live in peace was referred to in the preamble of the Constitution of Japan and that some district and high courts in Japan had recognized the existence of a right to live in peace as an individual right that might lead to remedies for victims of violations.

46. As a sustainable measure for lasting peace, the representative of the Hunger Project called for community-led development and empowerment, in particular of women, and leadership development in order to create the basis for a peaceful environment by giving people a voice in decisions that affected their lives and increasing the accountability of authorities.

47. In view of the fundamental role of education in changing the paradigm and recognizing the right to peace, the representative of Costa Rica noted that UNESCO, with its large network of associated schools, could use the Declaration on the Right to Peace as an additional tool to raise awareness and move closer to enforcement and implementation of that right.

48. In response, Mr. Tararas confirmed that UNESCO had been mobilizing different platforms to promote the right to peace, including the worldwide network of associated schools, the UNESCO chairs at academic institutions and local authorities. He reaffirmed the need for a bottom-up approach, including through youth empowerment, and stressed the importance of creativity, arts, music and sports as mediums that brought people together and could serve as vehicles for presenting messages.

49. Ms. Pochat added that social networks made it possible to know what was happening in real time. Arts and education were ways of engaging civil society and of working better as a society in a participatory manner.

C. Educating for peace

50. Mr. Garcia also chaired the third session, which focused on educating for peace pursuant to article 4 of the Declaration. The panellists were Francisco Rojas-Aravena, Rector of the University for Peace, and Koumbou Boly Barry, Special Rapporteur on the right to education.

51. Mr. Rojas-Aravena stressed that if people wanted peace, they had to educate for peace. Conflicts and crises were increasingly complex and required in-depth analysis, the construction of shared visions and pre-emptive actions. Such responses to conflicts and crises provided better opportunities for prevention, as highlighted by the Secretary-General and in the documents on peacebuilding and sustaining peace. In the current context of global interdependence, it was necessary to visualize and generate frameworks and operational platforms that allowed the link between peace and security, development and human rights to be transformed into specific actions that contributed to the de-escalation of national, regional and international tensions.

52. In that regard, Mr. Rojas-Aravena recalled that article 1 of the Declaration recognized the right of all people to enjoy peace, human rights and development, which also represented the three pillars of the United Nations. Furthermore, article 4 of the Declaration emphasized that international and national institutions of education for peace should be promoted in order to strengthen the spirit of tolerance, dialogue, cooperation and solidarity among all human beings. To that end, the Declaration provided that the University for Peace "should contribute to the great universal task of educating for peace by engaging in teaching, research, post-graduate training and dissemination of knowledge".

53. Mr. Rojas-Aravena noted that the University for Peace, together with Paz Sin Fronteras and the UNESCO Chair on Peace at Abat Oliba University, had published a book on the past, present and future of the right to peace.[6] In order to better understand the Declaration, the book explored several important developments in international law, such as the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace (1978), the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (1981), the Declaration on the Right of Peoples to Peace (1984) and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations Human Rights Declaration (2012). The book's authors had also conducted a detailed review of the codification process of the right to peace, initiated by the Commission on Human Rights and continued by the Human Rights Council, following the initial impulse of UNESCO. The valuable work carried out in that field by the Advisory Committee and the open-ended intergovernmental working group on the draft United Nations declaration on the right to peace were also analysed. Additionally, the book demonstrated the added value of the Declaration in the field of human rights, fundamental freedoms, and culture of peace.

54. Mr. Rojas-Aravena reaffirmed the commitment of the University for Peace to education for peace, prevention, non-violence, inclusion, social cohesion, the rule of law, legality and ethics. He stressed the importance of developing education that promoted competencies, values and behaviours that contributed to peace, justice, sustainable development, democracy, human rights, solidarity and the protection of the planet. Promoting and supporting human rights meant building coexistence, cooperation and solidarity, all of which were essential foundations for peace.

55. Achieving and sustaining peace required prevention, the development of new leadership and holistic educational policies on the different tendencies that influenced conflicts and complex crises. The University for Peace had developed programmes for prevention education, carried out through its master's and doctorate degrees, its customized training courses and its academic publications. The University was educating and training leaders for the prevention, mediation, transformation and resolution of conflicts, and for contributing to post-conflict contexts, all with the aim of achieving sustainable peace.

56. In order to promote and implement the Declaration, Mr. Rojas-Aravena suggested the creation by the Council of a biannual forum for education for peace and human rights. That could be a space for dialogue and interaction between different entities of the United Nations system and other stakeholders, including civil society and grass-roots organizations, on the different issues related to peace and human rights. The structure of the forum would be inspired by best practices and the previous experience of the United Nations and other inclusive global forums.

57. Furthermore, Mr. Rojas-Aravena recommended establishing, under the leadership of the Director-General of the United Nations Office at Geneva, a working group comprised of United Nations entities based in Geneva that would meet annually to analyse United Nations best practices on peace education. The results of those meetings could be compiled into an annual publication, which would increase the possibility of those best practices being replicated worldwide.

58. In addition, he suggested creating an educational museum for peace and a multicultural space for dialogue between all stakeholders, particularly youth. The University for Peace offered its campus in Costa Rica as a place for dialogue, the exchange of mutual knowledge and the generation of trust and public policy. Peace education should also be included in the monitoring and implementation mechanisms of the World Programme for Human Rights Education. In that context, the following areas should be focused on: the creation of an annual peace education award; the organization of dialogues and regional consultations in the field of irenology (the study of peace); the prevention of violent extremism; the promotion of cultural diversity; actions to combat racism, intolerance and xenophobia; the integration of a course on education for global citizenship in schools; and promoting studies on non-violent communication and education for peace in university curricula.

[6] Christian Guillermet-Fernández and David Fernández Puyana, with the contribution of Miguel Bosé, *The Right to Peace: Past, Present and Future* (San José, 2017).

59. Finally, Mr. Rojas-Aravena stressed the importance of effectively implementing the Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace, with a focus on human security and advancement towards the goals of the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda. The culture of peace should be strengthened within the framework of the United Nations through the progressive development of a culture of prevention, cooperation, the rule of law and the construction of solid institutions. Developing the right to peace required creating State policies to dismantle the existing culture of war, which meant educating for coexistence, inclusion, participation, cooperation, reconciliation, democratic governance and freedom. In order to increase the number of students from different nationalities represented at the University for Peace, States were requested to consider establishing scholarship programmes for their nationals.

60. Ms. Boly Barry began by noting that Nelson Mandela had called education the most powerful weapon for transforming the world. As Special Rapporteur on the right to education, she reaffirmed the Deputy High Commissioner's call for a holistic vision of peace. Furthermore, she highlighted that the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, which also included in its article 13 the right of everyone to education, promoted equality of opportunity. However, more than 1 billion human beings around the world did not enjoy the right to education. She noted that most of them were women, highlighting that there was a correlation between exclusion and inequality.

61. Peace was not the lack of conflict in a given territory; it also related to spirituality and love between and among human beings. Ms. Boly Barry commended UNESCO for its work on global citizenship education and a culture of peace and called for the development of more norms and standards surrounding spirituality. Since in times of war there was fear of others, both individually and collectively, that fear needed to be addressed, notably through education as a fundamental pillar of societies.

62. Ms. Boly Barry recommended that UNESCO continue with its vision in pursuing Sustainable Development Goal 4 (quality education). Furthermore, States should bear in mind peace and spirituality. In many countries civil society organizations had developed useful activities and experiences in pursuing a culture of peace. Information on such work in educating for peace should be better disseminated. In that context, educational outreach and the involvement of children, youth and women should be increased. For many years, women had been marginalized in peacebuilding processes and they should be brought back into peacebuilding. Finally, she recognized the important work by academics to develop best practices, for example in transitional justice and education, and she called for better dissemination at the international and national levels of such best practices.

63. In the following discussion, the representative of the Plurinational State of Bolivia recommended that academic institutions promote the notion of a pacifist State and closely examine the propagation of the glorification of war and apologies of war in view of their impacts on societies and the negative consequences for economic, cultural and social development.

64. The representative of the Spanish Society for International Human Rights Law reiterated the following civil society proposals, which had been made in September 2017:

(a) All peoples and individuals had a right to a comprehensive peace and human rights education within the framework of the Declaration and the Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace and dialogue among cultures;

(b) Education and socialization for peace was a sine qua non for unlearning war and building identities disentangled from violence;

(c) Everyone had the right to denounce any event that threatened or violated the right to peace, and to participate freely in peaceful activities for the defence of the right to peace;

(d) States should undertake to revise national laws and policies that were discriminatory against women, and adopt legislation to address domestic violence, trafficking of women and girls and gender-based violence.[7]

65. Noting that the right to peace also included the right to human rights education and education for peace, the representative of the Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII stressed that defending dialogue and peaceful coexistence among cultures, civilizations, religions or beliefs was essential to combating racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance in order to create an environment conducive to stable peace.

66. Referring to the 2009 expert workshop on the right of peoples to peace (see A/HRC/14/38), the former Independent Expert on the promotion of a democratic and equitable international order highlighted the importance of education on human rights instruments, notably the prohibition of propaganda for war (International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, art. 20 (1)), freedom of opinion and expression (ibid., art. 19) and freedom of religion or belief, including the right of conscientious objection to military service (ibid., art. 18).

IV. Concluding remarks

67. In her concluding remarks, the moderator highlighted several recommendations made by panellists and participants during the intersessional workshop. The international community should deploy maximum efforts and creativity to reach a consensus on the title and article 1 of the Declaration on the Right to Peace. All States should review and amend their laws and policies in the light of international best practices regarding the promotion of peace and human rights. In order to promote the conditions for sustainable peace and to break away from the continuing cycle of developing new and more effective weapons, disarmament practitioners should overcome internalized attitudes that legitimated the use of force and militarization. Civil society activities should be supported in assisting the implementation of the Declaration, including through advocacy, research, social networks, art and concerts.

68. The moderator also noted the suggestion that various special procedure mandate holders should elaborate in their respective mandates the multidimensional notion of peace and the role of dialogue, tolerance, mediation, assistance and cooperation. The 2030 Agenda should be used in the context of implementing the Declaration by building a shared vision of society, with equality and inclusion at the centre of implementation efforts and a holistic and people-centred approach.

69. Another recommendation reiterated by the moderator was for the Human Rights Council to create a biannual forum for education for peace and human rights, providing space for dialogue and interaction between different entities of the United Nations system and other stakeholders, including civil society and grass-roots organizations, on the different issues related to peace and human rights. She also noted the recommendation that OHCHR should mainstream the right to peace and make related information accessible on its website. A working group comprised of United Nations entities based in Geneva should be established to analyse United Nations best practices on peace education, publishing the results of its annual meetings.

70. Moreover, the moderator recalled the suggestion to create an educational museum for peace or a multicultural space for dialogue between all stakeholders, particularly youth. Peace education should be included in the monitoring and implementation mechanisms of the World Programme for Human Rights Education. Human rights education should include a focus on non-discrimination, religious tolerance, the prohibition of propaganda for war and the right to conscientious

[7] See article 5 of the draft declaration proposed by civil society organizations on 20 September 2017.

objection to military service. All efforts should be gender sensitive and include women, children and persons with disabilities in the work on the right to peace.